

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

BRITTANY E. MARTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

HENN LESPERANCE PLC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:24-cv-00072

HON. Hala Y. Jarbou
Magistrate Ray Kent

Brittany E. Martin
Plaintiff in Pro Se
(616) 822-9423
23 College Ave. SE, APT. 18
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
bmartino211@outlook.com

Lee T. Silver (P36905)
Michael L. Gutierrez (P79440)
Daniel J. Hatch (P79258)
Tyler A. Burk (P85077)
BUTZEL LONG, PC
Attorneys for Henn Lesperance PLC,
Kevin Lesperance, Malgorzata
("Gosia") Walker, and Roy H. Johnson
300 Ottawa Ave. NW, Suite 620
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
silver@butzel.com
gutierrez@butzel.com
hatchd@butzel.com
burkt@butzel.com

*****EXPIDITED CONSIDERATION REQUESTED*****

**PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO
FILE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT PENDING RESOLUTION OF
PLAINTIFF'S APPEAL OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S ORDER (ECF NO. 106)**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 6(b)(1)(A) and W.D. Mich. LCivR 7.1(c), Plaintiff Ms. Brittany E. Martin respectfully requests an extension of the current deadline to file her Second Amended Complaint, from **April 18, 2025**, to **28 days after the District Judge issues a ruling** on her pending Appeal of Magistrate Judge's Order (ECF No. 106), **unless the District Judge's ruling specifies a different time**. In support, Plaintiff states the following:

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. On March 21, 2025, the Court entered an Order (ECF No. 105) striking Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (FAC) and permitting her to file a revised Second Amended Complaint (SAC) by **April 18, 2025**, subject to specific formatting and page limitations.
2. On April 4, 2025, Plaintiff timely filed an Appeal of the Magistrate Judge's Order (ECF No. 106).
3. On April 7, 2025, the Court issued an Order (ECF No. 108) directing Defendants to file their response to Plaintiff's appeal by April 18, 2025. As such, the Court will not be in a position to resolve Plaintiff's appeal until after that date.

APPLICABLE LAW

This request is made before the current deadline has expired and thus is governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 6(b)(1)(A), which provides that a Court may, for good cause, extend the time for an act to be done with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a party makes such request before the original time or its extension expires.

W.D. Mich. LCivR 7.1(c) provides that the Court may, in its discretion, enlarge “any time, word count, or page limit established by these rules, with or without prior notice or motion.” *Id.*

ARGUMENT

I. Good cause exists to extend the deadline for Plaintiff to file her SAC.

A. Extending the deadline promotes judicial economy and efficiency.

The requested extension is both reasonable and necessary to avoid unnecessary, duplicative litigation and to ensure efficient case management. Plaintiff’s objections directly challenge the procedural and substantive bases for the Order and the limits imposed on repleading. Requiring Plaintiff to replead under limitations that are presently subject to judicial review would not only be inefficient, but would risk further amendments, wasted effort, and procedural complications should the Order be modified or vacated in whole or in part.

B. This request is brought in good faith, not for the purpose of delay, and prior to the expiration of the current deadline.

This is Plaintiff’s first request for an extension related to the SAC deadline. Plaintiff acted promptly to seek Defendants concurrence and in filing this request after following her Appeal of Magistrate Judge’s Order (ECF No. 106). She is diligently attempting to resolve complex issues in good faith while respecting the Court’s time and resources.

C. Granting this extension will not prejudice Defendants.

Defendants will suffer no prejudice from this limited extension, which simply aligns the repleading schedule with the outcome of a pending legal issue that could significantly affect the scope and form of Plaintiff's SAC.

REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

Given the approaching deadline, Plaintiff respectfully requests expedited consideration on this issue.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

1. Grant expedited consideration of this request;
2. Extend the deadline for filing her Second Amended Complaint to **28 days after** the District Judge rules on her pending Appeal of Magistrate Judge's Order (ECF No. 106), **unless otherwise specified**; and
3. Grant any further relief the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Brittany E. Martin
Plaintiff

Dated: April 8, 2025

By: /s/ Brittany E. Martin
Brittany E. Martin, in Pro Se
23 College Ave. SE, APT. 18
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
(616) 822-9423
bmartin0211@outlook.com